



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,257	10/23/2003	Melissa W. Dunn	13768.467	9411

47973 7590 11/16/2007  
WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT  
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER  
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

ORR, HENRY W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/16/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/692,257

Applicant(s)

DUNN ET AL.

Examiner

Henry Orr

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6, 7, 10-25, 27, 28, 31-39 and 42-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6, 7, 10-25, 27-28, 31-39 and 42-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 2176

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to applicant's amendment dated 9/21/2007.
2. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10-25, 27-28, 31-39 and 42-44 are pending in the case.
3. Claims 5, 8, 9, 26, 29, 30, 40 and 41 are cancelled.
4. Claims 42-44 are newly added.
5. Claims 1, 15, 22 and 36 are independent claims.

### **Applicant's Response**

6. In Applicant's response dated 9/21/2007, applicant has amended the following:

a) Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 14-16, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 31 and 35-37

Based on Applicant's amendments and remarks, the following objections and rejections previously set forth in Office Action dated 6/22/2007 are withdrawn:

a) Objection to Drawings

b) Objection to claims 1-14 and 36-39

c) 35 U.S.C. 101 Rejection to claims 22-35 and 40

d) 35 U.S.C. 112 2<sup>nd</sup> 112 Rejection to claims 1-14, 22-35, 37-39 and 41

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

7. It is desirable to avoid the submission of long lists of documents if it can be avoided. Eliminate clearly irrelevant and marginally pertinent cumulative information. If a long list is submitted, highlight those documents which have been specifically brought to Applicant's attention and/or are known to be of most significance. See *Penn Yan*

*Boats, Inc. v. Sea Lark Boats, Inc.*, 359 F. Supp. 948, 175 USPQ 260 (S.D. Fla. 1972),  
aff'd, 479 F.2d 1338, 178 USPQ 577 (5th Cir. 1973), cert. denied, 414 U.S. 874 (1974).

The information disclosure statements (hereinafter, "IDS") filed 7/13/2007, 8/24/2007 and 10/22/2007 are 21 pages long and represents thousands of pages of highly technical disclosure. Thus, the IDS is a "long list." Moreover, a number of the references do not appear to be material to the patentability of the claimed invention.

Thus, the references cited in the IDS will not be considered until an underlining of the most relevant references is provided and the references that are not material to the patentability of the claimed invention are deleted from the IDS. Do not highlight the most relevant references, since the IDS will be scanned and the highlighted references will not be visible. Rather, underline the most relevant references listed in the IDS.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claim 3, 4, 24, 25 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably

Art Unit: 2176

convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 3:

Claim 3 recites: "providing the user with **an option to selectively restrict a portion of the contact information** provided to the application".

There is no mention of the newly amended limitation in the original Specification. Thus, the limitations include subject matter that was not described in the original Specification.

If the examiner has overlooked the portion of the original Specification that describes this feature of the present invention, then Applicant should point it out (by page number and line number) in the response to this Office Action.

Applicant may obviate this rejection by canceling the claim.

Claim 24:

Claim 24 recites: "providing the user with **an option to block** the application from receiving a some of the contact information".

There is no mention of the newly amended limitation in the original Specification. Thus, the limitations include subject matter that was not described in the original Specification.

If the examiner has overlooked the portion of the original Specification that describes this feature of the present invention, then Applicant should point it out (by page number and line number) in the response to this Office Action.

Applicant may obviate this rejection by canceling the claim.

Claim 44:

Claim 44 recites: "wherein **the interface window restricts the list** of selectable contact personas to only contact personas of the user".

There is no mention of the newly amended limitation in the original Specification. Thus, the limitations include subject matter that was not described in the original Specification.

If the examiner has overlooked the portion of the original Specification that describes this feature of the present invention, then Applicant should point it out (by page number and line number) in the response to this Office Action.

Applicant may obviate this rejection by canceling the claim.

Claims 4 and 25:

Dependent claims 4 and 25 are rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of their respective base claims.

**10. Claims 22-25, 27, 28, 31-39 and 43 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

Claim 22:

Art Unit: 2176

Claim 22 appears to be a manufacture claim depending on a method claim. Therefore, the scope of the statutory category of the claim is not clear, rendering the scope of the claim as indefinite.

Claim 36:

Claim 36 appears to be a manufacture claim depending on a method claim. Therefore, the scope of the statutory category of the claim is not clear, rendering the scope of the claim as indefinite.

Claims 23-25, 27, 28, 31-35, 37-39 and 43:

Dependent claims 23-25, 27, 28, 31-35, 37-39 and 43 are rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of their respective base claims.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**12. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10-25, 27-28, 31-39 and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brown, U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0156895 A1.**

Claim 1:

Brown teaches a computing system that is in communication with at least one application (see par. 27, Figures 1-3). **(claim 1; i.e., In a computing system that is in communication with at least one application)**

Brown teaches a method for controlling how contact information is provided to one or more applications (see par. 27). **(claim 1; i.e., a method for controlling how contact information is provided to one or more applications, the method comprising:)**

Brown teaches a contact information module comprising of one or more applications and the contact information module shares contact information via detecting a request initiated by a particular user from the one or more applications (see par. 27, par. 32). **(claim 1; i.e., detecting a request from an application for contact information corresponding to a particular user;)**

Brown teaches prior to providing the user's application with access to the contact information, determining whether the user's application is authorized to access the contact information (see par. 34, par. 39). **(claim 1; i.e., prior to providing the application with access to the contact information, determining whether the application is authorized to access the contact information;)**



Brown teaches upon determining that the user's application is authorized to access the contact information, identifying available contact personas associated with the particular user, each of the contact personas comprising contact information about the particular user and presenting to the user a list of selectable contact personas (see abstract, par. 35) **(claim 1; i.e., upon determining that the application is authorized to access the contact information, identifying available contact personas associated with the particular user, each of the contact personas comprising contact information about the particular user; upon identifying the available contact personas, presenting to the user a list of selectable contact personas associated with the user and that each include contact information corresponding to the user;)**

Examiner interprets the user's application to be capable of accessing and updating his or her own contact personas comprising contact information (see abstract).

Brown teaches prompting the user to select a specific group of contact information ("contact persona") from the groups of contact information ("listed contact personas") that will be shared with an identified person (see par. 35). **(claim 1; i.e., receiving a user selection of a contact persona from the list of the listed contact personas;)**

Brown teaches upon receiving the user selection of the specific group of contact information, determining an appropriate format in which the contact information corresponding to the selected contact persona will be presented to the user's application, with the user's application being provided with the selected specific group of

Art Unit: 2176

contact information (see par. 35-36). **(claim 1; i.e., upon receiving the user selection of the listed contact persona, determining an appropriate format in which the contact information corresponding to the selected contact persona will be presented to the application; and providing the application with the contact information corresponding to the selected contact persona.)** Examiner interprets the user to be capable of updating his or her own groups of contact information (i.e., business or personal) via user's application.

Claim 2:

Brown teaches each of the available contact personas correspond to a single user of the computing system (see abstract). **(claim 2; i.e., wherein each of the available contact personas correspond to a single user of the computing system.)**

Claim 3:

Brown teaches prior to providing the user's application with contact information, providing the user with an option to selectively permit access to a portion of the contact information provided to the user's application (see par. 35). **(claim 3; i.e., prior to providing the application with the contact information, providing the user with an option to selectively restrict a portion of the contact information provided to the application.)** Examiner interprets that by permitting access to a portion, Brown's invention is also restricting access to the portion that is not permitted.

Art Unit: 2176

Claim 4:

Brown teaches displaying default selections (i.e., personal information, business information) to inform the user what the contact information will be used for (i.e., personal or business) (see par. 35). **(claim 4; i.e., displaying a privacy value proposition to inform the user what the contact information will be used for.)**

Examiner interprets the displayed default selections to be equivalent to a privacy value proposition because the default selections are capable of informing the user what the contact information will be used for (i.e., personal use or business use).

Claim 6:

Brown teaches controlling what corresponding contact information is provided to the user's application which is capable of constituting a subset (i.e., personal information) of the available contact information (i.e., personal and business information) (see par. 35). **(claim 6; i.e., wherein the corresponding contact information to be provided to the application constitutes a subset of the available contact information associated with the selected contacted persona.)**

Claim 7:

Brown teaches wherein the subset (i.e., personal information) of the available contact information (i.e., personal and business information) is selected based on the intended use of the contact information (see par. 35). **(claim 7; i.e., wherein the**

**subset of the available contact information to be provided to the application is selected based on the intended use of the contact information.)**

Examiner interprets the intended use of the personal and/or business information to be for personal or business purposes, respectively.

Claim 10:

Brown teaches whether the user's application is authorized to access the contact information is determined based upon one or more authorization provided in an access control list (see par. 36). **(claim 10; i.e., wherein whether the application is authorized to access the contact information is determined based upon one or more authorizations provided in an access control list of the computing system.)**

Claim 11:

Brown teaches the application requesting information to be capable of being hosted on a remote system communicating via Internet with the computing system (see par. 8, par. 25, par. 29, Figures 1-2). **(claim 11; i.e., wherein the application requesting information is hosted on a remote system that is in communication with the computing system through the Internet.)**

Claim 12:

Brown teaches the application requesting the contact information to be capable of being hosted by the computing system (see par. 8, par. 25, par. 29, Figures 1-2).

Art Unit: 2176

**(claim 12; i.e., wherein the application requesting the contact information is hosted by the computing system.)**

Claim 13:

Brown teaches contact information including a name and an address (see par. 20). **(claim 13; i.e., wherein the requested contact information includes at least one of a name and an address.)**

Claim 14:

Brown teaches a first contact persona (i.e., personal information) differing from a second contact persona (i.e., business information) and for both contact personas to correspond to the user (see par. 35).

**(claim 14; i.e., wherein the available contact information corresponding to a first contact persona differs from the contact information corresponding to a second contact persona, even though the first and second contact personas both correspond to the same user.)**

Claim 15:

Brown teaches providing an interface object for allowing a user to select a contact persona from a plurality of possible contact personas as recited in claim 15 (see par. 35). **(claim 15; i.e., in response to a request for contact information by an**

**application, providing an interface object comprising a plurality of listed and selectable contact personas that are all associated with a single person and allowing a user to select one of the contact personas to be provided to the application, wherein the respective contact information corresponding to a first contact persona differs from the available contact information corresponding to a second contact persona, even though the first and second contact personas are both associated with the same person;)**

Brown teaches in response to a user selection of a contact persona, displaying the respective contact information corresponding to the selected contact persona (see par. 41-42). **(claim 15; i.e., in response to a user selection of a particular contact persona, displaying the respective contact information corresponding to the selected contact persona;)**

Brown teaches updating ("modify") the respective contact information as recited in claim 15 (see abstract, par. 32, par. 35, par. 41, par. 46). **(claim 15; i.e., and enabling the user to modify the respective contact information corresponding to the selected contact persona;)**

Brown teaches a user initiating an application to seek contact information from the computing system, and providing the respective approved contact information corresponding to the selected contact persona (see par. 27, par. 32, par. 35). **(claim 15; i.e., and upon the user approving the respective contact information, providing the respective contact information corresponding to the selected contact persona**

Art Unit: 2176

**to the application.)**

Claim 16:

Brown teaches a plurality of selectable contact personas including at least a business persona and a personal persona (see par. 35). **(claim 16; i.e., wherein the plurality of listed and selectable contact personas includes at least a business persona, a personal persona, and an anonymous persona.)**

Claim 17:

Brown teaches an approved list associated with the stored contact information (see par. 36, par. 38). **(claim 17; i.e., wherein the respective contact information is displayed with one or more privacy policies of the application that specify at least one of how and when the contact information will be used by the application.)**

Examiner interprets the approved list to include contact information of when the contact information will be used by the application (i.e., when a user on the approved list attempts to access the contact information with the application). The approved list is interpreted to be a form of a privacy policy because the approved list communicates when an application used by a user cannot access the stored contact information.

Claims 18-20:

Art Unit: 2176

Claims 18, 19, and 20 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in method claims 11, 12 and 13 respectively; therefore the method claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 11, 12 and 13 above.

Claim 21:

Brown teaches contact personas are associated with a logged on user of the computing system (see par. 34, par. 39, par. 45). **(claim 21; i.e., wherein the contact personas are associated with a logged on user of the computing system.)**

Claims 22-24:

Claims 22-24 include a program embodied on a computer readable medium to implement the steps that are substantially encompassed in method claims 1-3 respectively; therefore the claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 1-3 above.

Claim 25:

Claim 25 includes a program embodied on a computer readable medium to implement the steps that are substantially encompassed in method claim 4; therefore the claim is rejected under the same rationale as method claim 4 above.

Claims 27 and 28:



Claims 27 and 28 include a program embodied on a computer readable medium to implement the steps that are substantially encompassed in method claims 6 and 7 respectively; therefore the claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 6 and 7 above.

Claims 31-35:

Claims 31-35 include a program embodied on a computer readable medium to implement the steps that are substantially encompassed in method claims 10-14 respectively; therefore the claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 10-14 above.

Claims 36-39:

Claims 36, 37, 38 and 39 are substantially encompassed in method claims 15, 16, 17 and 18 respectively; therefore claims 36, 37, 38 and 39 are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 15, 16, 17 and 18 above.

Claim 42:

Brown teaches wherein the plurality of listed and selectable contact personas includes business information (see par. 35). **(claim 42; i.e., wherein the plurality of listed and selectable contact personas also includes an e-commerce persona.)** Examiner interprets the business information to be capable of being use as e-commerce information because e-commerce information is related to business information.

Claim 43:

Claim 43 includes a program embodied on a computer readable medium to implement the steps that are substantially encompassed in method claim 42; therefore the claim is rejected under the same rationale as method claim 42 above.

Claim 44:

Brown teaches an application capable of having an interface window to display only the contact personas of the user, when the user updates his or her own contact information (see abstract, par. 27). **(claim 44; i.e., wherein the list of selectable contact personas are present in an interface window and when wherein the interface window restricts the list of selectable contact personas to only contact personas of the user.)**

***Response to Arguments***

13. Applicant's arguments filed 9/21/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

**Prior Art Rejections**

Applicant argues that Brown fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention, particularly in view of the claim amendments that have been made by this paper which were discussed with the Examiner during the in person interview. In particular, while Brown generally discloses embodiments for controlling access to contact information, Brown fails to teach or suggest any embodiment as recited in claim 1 wherein an application's access, not a user's access, is controlled. Instead, Brown teaches that a contact information module (i.e. software) can be used to permit an individual to control access to his or her contact information by another individual (see Response Page 13 last full paragraph).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Firstly, Examiner notes that possible proposed claim amendments were discussed during the interview (see Interview summary dated 8/27/2007). However, no agreement was reached as to whether the proposed claim amendments would overcome the applied Brown reference.

Secondly, Brown does suggest an embodiment wherein an application access is controlled. Applicant admits that Brown teaches that a contact information module can be used to permit an individual to control access to his or her contact information by another individual. Brown also teaches the contact information module to comprise of one or more applications with which contacts information can be shared (see par. 27).

Therefore, if the contact information module can be used to permit and the contact information module comprises of one or more applications, then clearly Brown must teach or suggest controlling an application access because an application can be used for the individual to communicate a request to access contact information.

Applicant asserts that in Brown a user is requesting contact information, not an application (see Response Page 13 last two lines of last full paragraph).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

In Brown, an individual user must request contact information by using an application of the contact information module (see par. 27). An individual user is not capable of requesting contact information without an application because Brown discloses an application permitting access to contact information. Therefore, an application communicates the user's request to access contact information.

Applicant argues Brown fails to teach any method for controlling access to contact information by presenting the user with a list of the available contact personas corresponding to the contact information from which list the user selects an appropriate contact persona to be provided to the application, particularly a list of selectable contact personas that each correspond to contact information about the user (see Response Page 14 1<sup>st</sup> full paragraph).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Brown teaches a method of permitting a user to control access to what information is viewable (see par. 35).

Brown further teaches the capability of a user to manually select each piece of contact information to be shared (see par. 35).

Therefore, Brown must anticipate presenting the user with a list of available contact personas (i.e., personal or business information) corresponding to the contact information about the user from which the user can manually select the appropriate piece of contact information to be shared.

Applicant argues that the present claims require the user's concurrent involvement in the provision of identifying and selecting contact information to be presented the application, after the application requests the contact information, and prior to presenting the information to the application. Not only does Brown fail to disclose this limitation, but it would be incapable of performing it. (See Applicant Response Page 14 2<sup>nd</sup> full paragraph)

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., user's concurrent involvement in the provision of identifying and selecting contact

information to be presented the application, after the application requests the contact information, and prior to presenting the information to the application) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant contends that the arguments for claim 1 also apply to claim 15. (see Response Page 14 3<sup>rd</sup> full paragraph) Therefore examiner responds to those same arguments for claim 15 with the same rationale as stated above for claim 1.

Applicant asserts that claim 15 also includes additional limitations that even further distinguish from Brown, including the limitation for enabling the user to modify the information after the selection of the persona is made and prior to presenting the information to the application. (see Response Page 14 3<sup>rd</sup> full paragraph)

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Brown teaches updating ("modify") the respective contact information as recited in claim 15 (see abstract, par. 32, par. 35, par. 41, par. 46). Therefore, the user can access his or her own contact information, and default selections have been made and prior to presenting the newly updated contact information to the applications when the newly updated contact is requested.

Applicant argues that because claims 22 and 36 are computer program product claims containing the same methods as claims 1 and 15 respectively, Brown likewise fails to teach or suggest the limitations of these claims. (see Response Page 14 4<sup>th</sup> full paragraph)

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Applicant arguments with respect to claims 22 and 36 are substantially encompassed in the arguments for claims 1 and 15 respectively, therefore examiner responds with the same rationale as stated above.

### ***Conclusion***

**14. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Henry Orr whose telephone number is (571) 270 1308. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8 to 4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on (571) 272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

11/9/2007  
HO

*/Doug Hutton/*  
Doug Hutton  
Supervisory Primary Examiner  
Technology Center 2100



